

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending. Claims 5, 13, 14, 20, 25, 33 and 34 have been allowed. By this Response, claims 1, 15 and 21 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5, 13, 14, 20-25, 33 and 34 have been allowed. Applicants appreciate the indication of claims 15-19 as containing allowable subject matter and would be allowable upon overcoming the § 112, second paragraph rejections. Applicants have amended claim 15 to address the § 112, second paragraph issue. Thus, claim 15 and its dependent claims are now in condition for allowance.

§112, 2nd paragraph

Claims 1-4, 6-12, 15-19, 21-24 and 26-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Specifically with regards to claims 1, 15 and 21 it is alleged that the recitation of "said uncovered portion of said display lacks antecedent basis and is unclear." In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 15 and 21 to clarify this feature. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejection

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 21-24 and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mok (U.S. Patent No. 6,008,986), in view of Malgouires (U.S. Patent 5,107,402), Tomkewitsch (EP 458019) and Batio (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,643). Claims 10-12 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) as being unpatentable over Mok, Malgouires, Tomkewitsch, Batio and Ames (U.S. Patent No. 4,787,040). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 21, as amended, reference a display having a single video screen in which the operational area only encompasses the area of the video screen not partially covered. Further, claims 1 and 21 reference the video screen being changeable in display size and reduced to encompass only said non-covered area.

In contrast, Batio which is relied upon to teach the use of an uncovered portion being operational when a part of a display means is partially covered, fails to teach these features. Batio instead teaches a display means which uses dual video screens. It is true that when one screen is covered the other can be operational. However, Batio does not teach the use of a single video screen in the display means in which when an area of the single video screen is partially covered the non-partially covered area of the video screen is only operational. In fact, Batio never references any type of partial covering of a single video screen and the functional aspects thereof.

Further, Batio fails to teach or suggest a video screen adjusting it's display size to encompass only said non-covered area. Batio teaches the use of two independent screens. If one is covered the other is in use, but nothing is taught to the partial covering of one of the single display screens, where the display scale is then adjusted to the non-covered area.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Mok, Malgouires, Tomkewitsch and Batio that teaches the feature of independent claims 1 and 21 as required. Dependent claims 2-4, 6-12, 23-24 and 26-32 are also distinguished from the above references for at least the reasons set

forth above as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-34 are distinguished over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings, Reg. No. 48,917 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit

Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 11, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Chad J. Billings
Registration No.: 48,917
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant